



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

gwh

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/731,994	12/09/2003	Khatoun Shahrabaki	34874-068 UTIL	5871

64280 7590 01/29/2007
MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY & POPEO, P.C.
9255 TOWNE CENTER DRIVE
SUITE 600
SAN DIEGO, CA 92121

EXAMINER

WATT, CHRIS A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2174

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/29/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/731,994

Applicant(s)

SHAHRBABAKI ET AL.

Examiner

Chris Watt

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 December 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Westerman ("Westerman" US Patent No. 6,404,443) in view of Young ("Young" US Patent No. 6,177,933).

Regarding independent claim 1, Westerman teaches a method of generating a graphical user interface (GUI) (i.e. col. 4 lines 30-33 of Westerman : " These elements are those typically found in most general purpose computers, and in fact, computer 48 is intended to be representative of a broad category of data processing devices capable of generating graphic displays"), the method comprising: grouping objects into object groups (i.e. col. 1 lines 41-42 of Westerman : " The windows are used to classify the objects in groups, according to the user's choice"); defining an arrangement for a plurality of the object groups (i.e. col. 5 lines 66-67 of Westerman : " The user interface of the invention includes means for defining a plurality of data structures that are called planes"; col. 4 lines 58-60 of Westerman : " As has been mentioned, the present invention provides a graphical user interface for managing a plurality of screen objects"), each object group corresponding (i.e. col. 6 lines 53-57 of Westerman : " The preferred means for selecting is by including means for displaying an identifying tab for

Art Unit: 2174

each plane, and means for activating the tab corresponding to the plane that is desired to be selected"); assigning a graphic pattern (i.e. col. 6 lines 22-25 of Westerman : " The interface of the invention also includes means for assigning each screen object to a specific one of the planes, such that at least two planes receive at least one object each"; col. 10 lines 4-6 of Westerman : " In addition, upon selection of a plane the tab corresponding to the selected plane is displayed more prominently than the other tabs") that is distinct (i.e. col. 1 lines 34-36 of Westerman : " More specifically, visually distinct display objects are provided on the display screen, and are commonly referred to as "icons""); generating a graphical structure (i.e. col. 8 lines 24-25 of Westerman : " Each group of data can be a window descriptor structure, which is used in creating the display") for each object to be represented in the GUI (i.e. col. 3 lines 14-17 of Westerman : "a diagram of a sample data structure for implementing the graphical user interface of the present invention, in parallel with a box representation of the screen objects that have been placed in the interface, and their attributes while in the interface"); generating a background region for the GUI for one or more related graphical structures associated with an object group, wherein the background region is based on the distinct graphic pattern for the relationship corresponding to the object group; and generating the GUI, wherein one or more related graphical structures are within the background region (i.e. col. 5 lines 19-21 of Westerman : " The frame is preferably shown colored in a sharp color contrast from the background color of second portion 84"). Westerman does not teach a relationship in the arrangement.

Young teaches a relationship in the arrangement (i.e. col. 7 lines 11-30 of Young : " A computer-implemented method for providing visual continuity when displaying related information on a computer monitor, comprising: retrieving a first set of data stored in a first electronic file and a second set of data stored in a second electronic file, the second set of data having a generative relationship to the first set of data; arranging the first set of data on a first page and the second set of data on a second page by tracking the first set of data and aligning the second set of data on the second page based on an arrangement of the first set of data on the first page; assigning a first display location to the first page and a second display location to the second page so that as a first one of the first and second pages is displayed on a computer monitor the first one of the first and second pages appears to substantially overlay a second one of the first and second pages; and displaying the first one of the first and second pages on the computer monitor"). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the relationship in the arrangement of Young with the method of generating a GUI of Westerman "for retaining visual continuity between data sets displayed on a computer monitor." (col. 2 lines 2-3 of Young)

Regarding dependent claim 2, see the analysis of claim 1 above. Young, in combination with Westerman, further teaches the method in accordance with claim 1, further comprising displaying the GUI (i.e. col. 1 lines 8-11 of Westerman : " displaying information graphically, and more particularly, the present invention relates to a computer controlled display system for managing and displaying screen objects on a computer screen").

Regarding dependent claim 3, see the analysis of claim 1 above. Young, in combination with Westerman, further teaches the method in accordance with claim 1, wherein the graphic pattern represents a color to be displayed in a background region (i.e. col. 5 lines 19-21 of Westerman : " The frame is preferably shown colored in a sharp color contrast from the background color of second portion 84").

Regarding dependent claim 4, see the analysis of claim 3 above. Young, in combination with Westerman, further teaches the method in accordance with claim 3, wherein each relationship in the arrangement is assigned a different color (i.e. col. 5 lines 19-21 of Westerman : " The frame is preferably shown colored in a sharp color contrast from the background color of second portion 84").

Regarding dependent claim 5, see the analysis of claim 4 above. Young, in combination with Westerman, further teaches the method in accordance with claim 4, wherein the different color is progressively lighter or darker according to the significance of the relationship in the arrangement (i.e. col. 5 lines 33-34 of Westerman : " Of those, tab 120 is highlighted, while the others are obscured in comparison").

Regarding dependent claim 6, see the analysis of claim 1 above. Young, in combination with Westerman, further teaches the method in accordance with claim 1, wherein the graphic pattern represents a shading pattern to be displayed in a background region (i.e. col. 3 lines 58-60 of Young : " Other techniques to highlight property overrides may include shading, font selection, animation, and transparent overlays").

Regarding dependent claim 7, see the analysis of claim 6 above. Young, in combination with Westerman, further teaches the method in accordance with claim 6, wherein the shading pattern includes a plurality of lines (i.e. col. 7 lines 23-25 of Westerman : " That is why that plane is shown in dot-dashed lines, instead of just dashed lines as the remaining planes 210, 240").

Regarding dependent claim 8, see the analysis of claim 6 above. Young, in combination with Westerman, further teaches the method in accordance with claim 6, wherein the shading pattern includes a color (i.e. col. 3 line 66-col. 4 line 3 of Young : " For example, if a font property and a pagination property had property overrides, the "Font" tab 242 and "Pagination" tab 244 may be shaded or the tab labels displayed using the color red").

Regarding dependent claim 9, see the analysis of claim 1 above. Young, in combination with Westerman, further teaches the method in accordance with claim 1, wherein at least one graphical structure is selectable by a user of the GUI for interaction (i.e. col. 10 lines 1-2 of Westerman : " All such displayed objects of the selected plane are selectable").

Regarding dependent claim 10, see the analysis of claim 1 above. Young, in combination with Westerman, further teaches the method in accordance with claim 1, wherein the arrangement is a hierarchy (i.e. col. 5 lines 10-13 of Young : " In a document having a hierarchical structure, styles associated with the selected text may be inherited by the selected text and stored in one or more data structures") and each relationship in the hierarchy is a level in the hierarchy (i.e. col. 5 lines 63-66 of Young :

"a template definition that includes one instance of a group title 670, two instances of a level 1 entry 672, and two instances of a level 2 entry 674").

Regarding independent claim 11, Westerman teaches a graphical user interface (GUI), comprising: one or more background regions displayed in the GUI, wherein each background region is based on a graphic pattern that is distinct (i.e. col. 5 lines 19-21 of Westerman : " The frame is preferably shown colored in a sharp color contrast from the background color of second portion 84"), and the graphic pattern is assigned (i.e. col. 7 lines 16-18 of Westerman : " The interface of the invention further includes means for displaying in viewport display area 82 at least one of the objects assigned to selected plane 220") in an arrangement defined (i.e. col. 5 lines 66-67 of Westerman : " The user interface of the invention includes means for defining a plurality of data structures that are called planes") for a plurality of object groups (i.e. col. 1 lines 41-42 of Westerman : " The windows are used to classify the objects in groups, according to the user's choice"), and wherein each object group includes one or more objects; and one or more graphical structures displayed in the GUI (i.e. col. 8 lines 24-25 of Westerman : " Each group of data can be a window descriptor structure, which is used in creating the display"), each graphical structure representing one of the one or more objects and being disposed in at least One of the one or more background regions corresponding (i.e. col. 5 lines 19-21 of Westerman : " The frame is preferably shown colored in a sharp color contrast from the background color of second portion 84"). Westerman does not teach a relationship in the arrangement.

Young teaches a relationship in the arrangement (i.e. col. 7 lines 11-30 of Young : " A computer-implemented method for providing visual continuity when displaying related information on a computer monitor, comprising: retrieving a first set of data stored in a first electronic file and a second set of data stored in a second electronic file, the second set of data having a generative relationship to the first set of data; arranging the first set of data on a first page and the second set of data on a second page by tracking the first set of data and aligning the second set of data on the second page based on an arrangement of the first set of data on the first page; assigning a first display location to the first page and a second display location to the second page so that as a first one of the first and second pages is displayed on a computer monitor the first one of the first and second pages appears to substantially overlay a second one of the first and second pages; and displaying the first one of the first and second pages on the computer monitor"). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the relationship in the arrangement of Young with the GUI of Westerman "for retaining visual continuity between data sets displayed on a computer monitor." (col. 2 lines 2-3 of Young)

Claim 12 is similar in scope to claim 3, differing primarily in that claim 12 is directed towards a GUI and claim 3 is directed toward a method, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 13 is similar in scope to claim 4, differing primarily in that claim 13 is directed towards a GUI and claim 4 is directed toward a method, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 14 is similar in scope to claim 5, differing primarily in that claim 14 is directed towards a GUI and claim 5 is directed toward a method, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 15 is similar in scope to claim 6, differing primarily in that claim 15 is directed towards a GUI and claim 6 is directed toward a method, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 16 is similar in scope to claim 7, differing primarily in that claim 16 is directed towards a GUI and claim 7 is directed toward a method, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 17 is similar in scope to claim 8, differing primarily in that claim 17 is directed towards a GUI and claim 8 is directed toward a method, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 18 is similar in scope to claim 9, differing primarily in that claim 18 is directed towards a GUI and claim 9 is directed toward a method, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 19 is similar in scope to claim 10, differing primarily in that claim 19 is directed towards a GUI and claim 10 is directed toward a method, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Regarding independent claim 20, Westerman teaches a method of generating a graphical user interface (GUI), the method comprising: grouping objects into object groups (i.e. col. 1 lines 41-42 of Westerman : " The windows are used to classify the objects in groups, according to the user's choice"); assigning a graphic pattern that is

Art Unit: 2174

distinct for at least one object group (i.e. col. 6 lines 22-25 of Westerman : " The interface of the invention also includes means for assigning each screen object to a specific one of the planes, such that at least two planes receive at least one object each"); generating a graphical structure for each object to be represented in the GUI (i.e. col. 8 lines 24-25 of Westerman : " Each group of data can be a window descriptor structure, which is used in creating the display"); generating a background region for the GUI associated with an object group, wherein the background region is based on the distinct graphic pattern corresponding to the object group; and generating the GUI, within the background region (i.e. col. 5 lines 19-21 of Westerman : " The frame is preferably shown colored in a sharp color contrast from the background color of second portion 84") and the GUI is configured to be modified by a user (i.e. col. 3 lines 55-58 of Westerman : " This apparatus may be specially constructed for the required purposes, or it may comprise a general purpose computer selectively activated or reconfigured by a computer program stored in the computer"). Westerman does not teach related graphical structures.

Young teaches related graphical structures (i.e. col. 7 lines 11-30 of Young : " A computer-implemented method for providing visual continuity when displaying related information on a computer monitor, comprising: retrieving a first set of data stored in a first electronic file and a second set of data stored in a second electronic file, the second set of data having a generative relationship to the first set of data; arranging the first set of data on a first page and the second set of data on a second page by tracking the first set of data and aligning the second set of data on the second page based on an

arrangement of the first set of data on the first page; assigning a first display location to the first page and a second display location to the second page so that as a first one of the first and second pages is displayed on a computer monitor the first one of the first and second pages appears to substantially overlay a second one of the first and second pages; and displaying the first one of the first and second pages on the computer monitor"). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the related graphical structures of Young with the method of generating a GUI of Westerman "for retaining visual continuity between data sets displayed on a computer monitor." (col. 2 lines 2-3 of Young)

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chris Watt whose telephone number is (571) 270-1046. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:30-4:00 Eastern.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on (571) 276-5619. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Chris A. Watt/

January 19, 2007

CAW

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100